

REMARKS

With the foregoing amendment claims 1-3, 5-14, and 21-27 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 9 and 25 are independent. No new matter has been added by the amendments. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application.

Rejection of Claims 1-3 and 7-8

Claims 1-3 and 7-8 stand rejected as being anticipated by Singkornrat (US 6,128,484). Applicant respectfully traverses.

With respect to claim 1, claim 1 is not anticipated by Singkornrat because Singkornrat does not disclose all of the features of claim 1. For example, at the least, Singkornrat does not disclose "a display driver coupled between said computer display device and said monitor wireless transceiver, wherein said display driver is configured to translate data between the monitor wireless transceiver and the computer display device," as is required by claim 1 (emphasis added).

The Office Action contends that the above mentioned feature of claim 1 is disclosed in the following passage from Singkornrat: "The remote receiver unit would then be adapted to demodulate the received signals to extract RGB signals and a monitor having an RGB input could be used." *Col. 2, ll 37-39*. Applicant submits that the above quoted passage discloses nothing more than a "demodulator" that is coupled between a transceiver and an RGB monitor.

A demodulator does not "translate data." A demodulator is an electronic circuit used to recover or extract the information modulated on a carrier wave of a signal.¹ Thus, in no sense of the word does a demodulator "translate data." Accordingly, even though Singkornrat discloses coupling a demodulator between the transceiver and the RGB monitor, Singkornrat does not anticipate claim 1 because claim 1 requires a driver configured to

¹ See *The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition* (defining the term demodulate to mean "To extract (information) from a modulated carrier wave") <http://dictionary.reference.com/search?r=1&q=demodulator>; see also Wikipedia, <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Demodulator> (defining the term demodulator to mean "an electronic circuit used to recover the information content from the carrier wave of a signal.")

translate data between the transceiver and the display device and a demodulator does not translate data.

In short, Singkornrat does not disclose “a display driver coupled between said computer display device and said monitor wireless transceiver, wherein said display driver is configured to translate data between the monitor wireless transceiver and the computer display device,” as is required by claim 1 (emphasis added). Thus, Singkornrat does not anticipate claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office indicate claim 1 as being allowable.

With respect to claim 2, 3 and 5-8, these claims depend from claim 1 and are therefore patentable for at least the same reason give above.

Rejection of claims 25-26

Claims 25-26 stand rejected as being anticipated by Riazi (US 6,748,005). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 25 has been amended to require “data translation means, coupled between said computer display device and said monitor wireless transceiver, for translating data between the monitor wireless transceiver and the computer monitor device.” Like Singkornrat, Riazi merely discloses a demodulator (see element 110 in FIG. 8) that is coupled to an antenna 34 and a monitor device 14. Accordingly, like Singkornrat, Riazi does not disclose a means for translating data between the monitor wireless transceiver and the computer monitor device. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 25-26 are patentable over the art of record.

Rejection of Claim 5-6

Claims 5-6 depend from claim 1, and, therefore, are patentable for at least the reason given above with respect to claim 1.

Rejection of Claim 9-11, 14, 21 and 24

Claims 9-11, 14, 21 and 24 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Singkornrat in view of Schindler (US 5,867,223). Applicant respectfully traverses.

With respect to claim 9, claim 9 is patentable over Singkornrat in view of Schindler because neither Singkornrat nor Schindler, considered alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the features of claim 9. For example, at the least, neither Singkornrat nor Schindler, considered alone or in combination, teach or suggest, “[a] monitor wireless transceiver [that] is configured to transmit a wireless communication to [a] computer wireless transceiver, wherein said wireless communication includes data and said unique address [of the computer main unit],” as is recited in claim 9.

The Examiner admits that Singkornrat “fails to teach a unique address for wireless communication.” However, Examiner relies on Schindler to make up for the deficient teachings of Singkornrat.

Schindler, however, does not teach or suggest a “wireless communication [that] includes ... said unique address [of the computer main unit],” as is required by claim 9. Schindler simply discloses a system having a plurality of wireless headphones and speakers. Each headphone/speaker is assigned a unique address so that audio data can be selectively transmitted to only one of the headphones/speakers. However, the headphones/speakers do not have a transmitter for transmitting data to a computer main unit. Accordingly, by definition, the headphones/speakers are incapable of “transmitting a wireless communication to [a] computer wireless transceiver, wherein said wireless communication includes data and said unique address [of the computer main unit],” as is recited in claim 9. Therefore, Schindler does not teach or suggest a “wireless communication [that] includes ... said unique address [of the computer main unit],” as is required by claim 9. For at least this reason, the rejection of claim 9 should be withdrawn.

With respect to claim 10-11, 14, 21 and 24, these claims depend from claim 9, and, therefore, are patentable for at least the reason given above with respect to claim 9.

Rejection of Claim 27

Claim 27 depends from claim 25, and, therefore, is patentable for at least the reason given above with respect to claim 25.


Rejection of Claims 12, 13, and 22-23

These claims depend from claim 9, and, therefore, are patentable for at least the reason given above with respect to claim 9.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections, and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,					
NAME AND REG. NUMBER	Brian Rosenbloom, Registration No.: 41,276				
SIGNATURE				DATE	7/9/05
Address	Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck Suite 800, 1425 K Street, N.W.				
City	Washington	State	D.C.	Zip Code	20005
Country	U.S.A.	Telephone	202-783-6040	Fax	202-783-6031